C.S.100 (3)

SINGLE BENCH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. NO. 2773 /2006

PETITIONER - Dr. K.K. Soni
S/o Late Shri R.K. Soni
Aged about 51 years,
Employed as Sr. Veterinary Surgeon,
Mobile Health Unit Office,
C/o Dy. Director
Veterinary Services, Durg
Resident of: M.A.-1, Padumnagar,
BHILAI-3, District: Durg (C.G.)

P.R. 2839/06
Presented by R Sharma
dated 13/6/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS - 1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through – The Secretary,
Department of Agriculture
(Animal Husbandry)
Mantralaya, D.K.S.Bhawan,
RAIPUR

2. The Director,
Veterinary Services,
RAIPUR, District-Raipur (C.G.)

3. The Dy. Director,
Veterinary Services,
DURG, District-Durg (CG)

CERTIFIED COPY
BILASPUR
13/6/06

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, CERTIORARI, PROHIBITION ETC.

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ...W.P.2773/ **सन् 2006**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

14-6-2006

Mr. Uttam Pandey, counsel for the petitioner.

Mr. Satish Gupta, Deputy Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents.

Heard both the counsel.

The case of the petitioner is that initially he was appointed as Assistant Veterinary Surgeon and presently he is posted at Mobile Health Unit, Durg, since 1999. The petitioner is suffering from heart problem. Therefore, he took treatment in Escorts Hospital, Raipur and has been advised to take rest. But he has been transferred vide order dated 31st March, 2006 (Annexure P-5) from Mobile Health Unit, Durg to Veterinary Hospital, Patan, District: Durg and there is no medical facilities at Patan, therefore, he will not be able to work at Patan on account of non-availability of medical facilities, as such, the petitioner made a representation on 10-4-2006. The respondent authorities are not deciding the representation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner has even filed W.P.No.2238/2006 in which this Court directed the respondents to decide the representation at the earliest, but the respondents are not deciding the representation. Therefore, learned counsel submits that his limited prayer is that the respondents be directed to decide the representation considering the difficulties of the petitioner and they should try to accommodate the petitioner in any place where proper medical facilities are available, to which learned counsel appearing for the State/respondents has no objection.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, respondent No.2 is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner after considering the grievances and medical grounds raised by the petitioner in his representation in an objective manner within a period of 20 days from today.

With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.

Consequently, M.(W.)P.No.2110/2006 also stands disposed of.

Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
L.C. Bhadoo
Judge